



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

11.2

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/798,203	03/11/2004	Haupt Rainer	11371-20	6176
<div>7590 Craig Summerfield Brinks Hofer Gilson &amp; Lione Suite 3600 455 N. City Front Plaza Drive Chicago, IL 60126</div>			<div>EXAMINER KAO, CHIH CHENG G</div>	
			<div>ART UNIT 2882</div>	<div>PAPER NUMBER</div>
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE			MAIL DATE	
3 MONTHS			01/24/2007	
			DELIVERY MODE	
			PAPER	

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.



## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Objections*

1. Claim 4 is objected to because of the following informalities, which appear to be minor draft errors including grammatical and/or lack of antecedent basis problems.

In the following format (location of objection; suggestion for correction), the following correction(s) may obviate the objection(s): (claim 4, line 1, "an x-ray source of claim 3"; replacing "3" with --1--).

For purposes of examination, the claims have been treated as such. Appropriate correction is required.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-9, and 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Khutoryansky et al. (US 5636259).
3. Regarding claims 1 and 11, Khutoryansky et al. discloses a support system for an x-ray source, comprising a ceiling holding or supporting platform (fig. 3, via #394) including a mounting device (fig. 3, #154), and a support arm fixedly secured about a horizontal axis (fig. 3,

Art Unit: 2882

#278 and 284) to the mounting device, such that the x-ray source (fig. 3, #112) is secured, rotatably about a substantially horizontal axis (fig. 3, #188), to the support arm, wherein a lower edge of the mounting device (fig. 3, lower edge of #276) and a lower edge of the support arm (fig. 3, lower edge of #278) are disposed vertically below the horizontal axis of rotation (fig. 3, #188) of the x-ray source, and wherein the horizontal axis of rotation of the x-ray source is positioned on the support arm such that a lower edge of the x-ray source is disposed below the lower edge of the support arm (fig. 3, lower edge of #278) and the lower edge of the mounting device (fig. 3, lower edge of #276), independently of an x-ray source angle of rotation about the horizontal axis (figs. 8-13, #112).

4. Regarding claim 2, Khutoryansky et al. further discloses wherein the support arm comprises a substantially right angled bend (fig. 3, #278 and 284).

5. Regarding claim 4, Khutoryansky et al. further discloses wherein the support arm (fig. 3, #278 and 284) is fixedly secured about a vertical axis to the mounting device (fig. 3, #154).

6. Regarding claims 5 and 13, Khutoryansky et al. further discloses wherein the mounting device is substantially vertically adjustable (fig. 3, via #156).

7. Regarding claim 7, Khutoryansky et al. further discloses wherein a line extension of the horizontal axis of rotation (fig. 3, #188) of the x-ray source extends through the mounting device (fig. 3, #154).

Art Unit: 2882

8. Regarding claim 8, Khutoryansky et al. further discloses wherein a line extension of the horizontal axis of rotation (fig. 3, #188) of the x-ray source extends laterally to a vertical side (fig. 3, side of #154) of the mounting device.

9. Regarding claim 9, Khutoryansky et al. further discloses wherein the line extension of the horizontal axis of rotation (fig. 3, #188) of the x-ray source, that extends laterally to a vertical side (fig. 3, side of #154) of the mounting device, is parallel to lines extending along each of two side edges of the x-ray source (fig. 3, #112), and wherein one of the lines of one of the two side edges of the x-ray source (fig. 3, #112) extends on one vertical side of the mounting device and the other line of the other side edge extends on another vertical side of the mounting device (fig. 3, #154).

10. Regarding claim 12, Khutoryansky et al. further discloses wherein the supporting platform is moveable (fig. 1, along #140 and 142).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Khutoryansky et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Horbaschek (US 2002/0118793).

Khutoryansky et al. discloses a system as recited above.

However, Khutoryansky et al. fails to disclose wherein a ceiling holder is rotatable about a substantially vertical axis.

Horbaschek teaches wherein a ceiling holder is rotatable about a substantially vertical axis (fig. 4 and paragraph 25, lines 6-9).

It would have been obvious, to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify the system of Khutoryansky et al. with the rotatable ceiling holder of Horbaschek, since one would have been motivated to make such a modification for more maneuverability (figs. 1-5) as implied from Horbaschek.

#### *Allowable Subject Matter*

12. Claim 10 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter.

Regarding claim 10, prior art fails to disclose or fairly suggest a support system for an x-ray source, including wherein a line extension of a horizontal axis of rotation of an x-ray source, that extends laterally to a vertical side of a mounting device, is parallel to lines extending along each of two side edges of the x-ray source, and wherein one of the lines of one of the two side edges of the x-ray source extends on one vertical side of the mounting device and the other line

of the other side edge extends through the mounting device, in combination with all the limitations in the claim.

***Response to Arguments***

13. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 2, 4-9, and 11-13 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.


Art Unit: 2882

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chih-Cheng Glen Kao whose telephone number is (571) 272-2492. The examiner can normally be reached on M - F (9 am to 5 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ed Glick can be reached on (571) 272-2490. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

  
gk

  
EDWARD J. GLICK  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER